

FY 2016 Social Innovation Fund Pay for Success Round 2  
Reviewer Quality Control Checklist for Panel Consensus Forms  
Updated October 3, 2016

- Header
  - Following items are correctly identified
    - Applicant ID
    - Legal Applicant
    - Panel
    - Reviewer name (first initial, last name - e.g. SCohn) ○ Use your judgment. Some items can simply be corrected by the POL to save back and forth, but if there are multiple mistakes, consider sending it back with guidance
  - Change status to 'approved' once approved
  - Change status to 'awaiting reviewer changes' if returned to reviewer or 'awaiting QC (quality control) by PC (Panel Coordinator)' if submitted for review or after revisions incorporated
- Ratings and comments ○ Ensure there are an appropriate number of comments for feedback ○ Ensure ratings and comments align
  - E.g. An "Excellent" rating should be reflected in an excellent-esque comment for that criterion
  - Sentences are complete
  - Comments should not quote application or use page numbers ○ Language cannot be inflammatory
- Clarifications
  - Adequate number of clarifications, based on ratings
    - Refer to "When to Write a Clarification" ○ Addresses an issue in the application
- Other considerations
  - Ensure these questions are completed

**For selection criterion: Program Design – Description of Activities: Core Program – 20 points**  
**Ensure the comments note whether it is clear the proposed developmental support or "SIF PFS Projects" is intended to provide supports to help a SIF-supported project.**

The selection criterion states "For Developmental Support for SIF PFS Projects applicants only: Describe a compelling program design in which subs are selected that demonstrate a link between the additional supports funded or provided as services and the likelihood a High Quality PFS Project Launches. This is for a project that has already been supported by SIF